

PLANNING COMMISSION

ACTION MINUTES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2004

Chair Gibson called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. at the Twin Pines Senior and Community Center.

1. ROLL CALL:

Present, Commissioners: Gibson, Parsons, Frautschi, Dickenson, Long, Wozniak, Horton
Absent, Commissioners: None

Present, Staff: Community Development Director Ewing (CDD), Principal Planner de Melo (PP), Associate Planner Swan (AP), City Attorney Savaree (CA), Recording Secretary Flores (RS)

2. AGENDA AMENDMENTS: None

3. COMMUNITY FORUM (Public Comments): None

4. CONSENT CALENDAR:

4A. Planning Commission Minutes of 10/19/04

MOTION: By Commissioner Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner Dickenson, to accept the Minutes of October 19, 2004 as presented.

Ayes: Frautschi, Dickenson, Horton, Wozniak, Parsons, Gibson
Noes: None
Abstain: Long

Motion passed 6/0/1

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Chair Gibson announced that there will be opportunity for people to speak up to two minutes each, and, since the hearing will be continued, the number of speakers will be limited to 30, and that thirty speakers had already submitted requests to speak.

5A. PUBLIC HEARING – 2548 Hallmark Drive

To consider a Conditional Use Permit and Single-Family Design Review to construct a 650 square-foot addition to the existing 2,820 square-foot single-family residence, resulting in a total of 3,470

square feet. The project will include ground floor modifications and a new second story for the existing single-story residence. (Appl. No. 2004-0049)

APN: 045-463-070; Zoned: PD (Planned Development)

CEQA Status: Categorical Exemption per Section 15303, Class 3a

Matt Grocott (Applicant)

Peggy and Preston Tom (Owner(s))

PP de Melo summarized the staff report, recommending approval with the Conditions of Approval as attached.

Responding to Commissioners' questions, PP de Melo stated that the driveway is not being proposed to be reduced and meets the maximum standard of 25 feet, and confirmed that there is no upper square footage limit for this planned development.

Matt Grocott, applicant, briefly reviewed the proposed project, noting that when they decided to do the second-story addition, they tried to be sensitive to the neighborhood regarding height issues and window placement.

C Frautschi commented that he appreciated the fact that they did not take the building up to the permitted 35 feet and felt that it is a very nice design.

Chair Gibson opened the Public Hearing. No one came forward to speak.

MOTION: By Vice Chair Parsons, seconded by Commissioner Long, to close the public hearing. Motion passed.

MOTION: By Commissioner Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner Dickenson, to adopt the Resolution approving the Conditional Use Permit and Single-Family Design Review at 2548 Hallmark Drive, with the attached Exhibit "A," Conditions of Project Approval (Appl. 2004-0049).

Ayes: Frautschi, Dickenson, Long, Horton, Wozniak, Parsons, Gibson

Noes: None

Motion passed 7/0

Chair Gibson noted that this decision may be appealed to the City Council within ten days.

5B. PUBLIC HEARING - 1405 Solana Drive

To consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Conceptual Development Plan Amendment for the Charles Armstrong School, an existing private school facility. The proposed Conceptual Development Plan Amendment includes construction of a new 14,700 square-foot activity center and addition of a 900 square-foot entry lobby to the existing multi-purpose building. The existing limitation on student enrollment will not change with this project. The number and configuration of the existing on-site parking areas would not change with this project. (Appl. No. 2003-0099)

APN: 045-122-190; Zoned: PD (Planned Development)

CEQA Status: Mitigated Negative Declaration

Mary Lou Orr (Applicant)
Charles Armstrong School (Owner)

Chair Gibson announced that State law requires that any Commissioner who has a conflict of interest is required to recuse him or herself from participation in discussion of the following matter and leave the room.

C Wozniak recused herself because she lives within 500 feet of the subject property and left the room. Chair Gibson noted that C Wozniak may return to the room to speak but would then have to again go out of the room.

C Horton wanted to publicly respond to Rosalie Whitlock's letter of November 9th to the City Attorney that requested that she recuse from this item. C Horton read the following statement into the record:

"There exists no personal source of income conflict with the applicant's request as referenced in the correspondence. I do not own property within 500' of Charles Armstrong School, although I am a resident of the neighborhood within which the school resides. The expansion being requested if it is approved will have no adverse effect on my real property, and that any denial of this application would not result in any personal gain on my behalf. I'd also like to state that I am fully aware of the required impartiality in my role as a Planning Commissioner. I intend to listen openly and fairly to the applicant's presentation and all public testimony and to make my decisions based on the research I have performed of the public record of Charles Armstrong School's history at its location on Solano Drive, as well as the staff report, letters from the school and residents of both the neighborhood and Belmont at large received for consideration at this hearing, and the public testimony that becomes part of this public hearing tonight. I will consider all as it relates to the Belmont General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and make my decisions based on this information as a Planning Commissioner for the City of Belmont."

C Gibson remarked as follows:

- Planning Commissioners are all volunteers appointed by the City Council in whom he has great confidence because they are intelligent, fair-minded and hard working, and he is sure there will be a fair decision out of this proceeding.
- The staff report is a large (50-page) document; therefore staff did not make a lot of copies, but that a few were available in binders to look at at the meeting and it can be accessed on the City's Website in PDF format.
- This hearing is only the first of five stages to get this project through to a building permit, and it will be continued to a date in December to be announced as soon as they have that date.
- The Planning Commission will not make a decision on this particular matter—they will make a recommendation to the City Council and the Council will follow that recommendation or not, as it sees fit.
- The procedure to be followed will be that staff will make a 10-minute oral summary of the staff report, the Charles Armstrong people will make a 20-minute presentation, and then they will have public testimony, which is limited to 30 speakers at 2 minutes each. He noted that he had made a decision to limit the number of people who can pool their 2

minutes as he felt he would rather hear each individual's unique point of view expressed in their own words. He therefore decided, in consultation with staff, to limit pooling to combinations of up to four people totaling 8 minutes. He added that the Mayor concurred with this decision. VC Parsons will operate a timer; when the beeper goes off the speaker will have a grace period to sum up and give his or her final sentence.

CDD Ewing summarized the staff report, highlighting the contents and noting that it is an expanded report in order to address some of the complicated issues raised by this request. He added that the City had received a tremendous volume of mail on the project, some of which arrived the day of the meeting and had not been sorted. Staff therefore recommended that the Planning Commission receive the report and begin taking testimony on the project and continue the matter to a future date so that staff could receive questions from the Commission for further research and response, copy and distribute remaining letters, and if, necessary, locate a larger venue for the next meeting. A continuance would also allow the Commission additional time to consider what has been presented prior to making its recommendation to Council.

Rosalee Whitlock, head of Charles Armstrong School (CAS), summarized the history of the school, noting it was founded to serve dyslexic learners whose needs cannot be met in a more traditional setting and that their goal is to return the students to their neighborhood schools as soon as they are able to become independent learners. She went on to say that about 50% of their children come from public schools and return to public schools and that no public funds are spent on their education, and that when the children are ready to return to public school, most are equipped for success so that the receiving schools do not need to provide expensive special services for them. She stated that the areas of sports, the arts, drama, science and technology are key components of their program – they are not add-ons – and staff has been especially trained in these areas. Their board of trustees and administration are fully committed to supplying whatever resources and curriculum materials are necessary to support that program, but the one missing piece is the facility that is needed to enhance that program. They've needed this critical component for over 22 years to support what they already do, and now they're asking for the right to build their proposed activity center – they simply want to build a gymnasium and a science and technology lab similar to those that are seen in other area schools. She asked why their children should not have the same resources – they own their property, they seek absolutely no public funds for building, and they are committed to creating a structure that is architecturally aligned with the school and will fit aesthetically into the neighborhood, and have gone to a great deal of expense to make this happen. Out of their commitment to be good neighbors, they've worked to maintain maximum open space in this building project so that the feel of the campus will remain open and parking will be preserved. Ms. Whitlock wanted to be clear about the following:

- First, they are not seeking an expansion of their use of the McDougal playing field. In 1984 they purchased the school from the Belmont School District along with a perpetual McDougal Park access agreement so that Belmont neighbors would have access to the playing field. For over the last 20 years they have extended themselves at their own expense and with no obligation to provide parking on their property, to improve the playground equipment, to provide clean bathroom facilities to their neighbors and other Belmont residents who use the field for community sports even when the school is closed. They provide picnic tables, water, and most importantly strive to provide a warm welcome to all of their neighbors. They are not asking for public funds to cover the cost of what

they offer the neighborhood. They do all of this out of an earnest attempt to be good neighbors and actually welcome the opportunity to do that.

- Secondly, they do not seek an expansion of their enrollment. They have 247 children. They follow a small school's model that is dependent on providing education for no greater than 260 children. They are not going to change their commitment to the small school's model.
- Third, they do not seek to build a high school – that's not their model, that's never been their plan.
- Fourth, they do not seek an expansion of their program. This activity center will simply allow them to fully implement the existing programs which have been marginally accomplished because of the lack of this facility. They just want to enhance what they already do.
- Fifth, they will not add more traffic because they are not expanding their enrollment or their programs.

Ms. Whitlock concluded by stating that they've been in Belmont for over 20 years and they've done absolutely every single thing they can to enhance this program except for building this facility, which they desperately need. She feels that they have enormous support for this project from many of their neighbors, who were at the meeting, and they've submitted over 700 signatures from Belmont residents who are supporting them. There are over 50 postcards from Belmont merchants that have been sent in in support because their families spend thousands of dollars in Belmont stores every month, and they have over 300 letters written by their kids, parents, alumni, faculty and board of trustees, and they have many supporters at the meeting. They've held over seven neighborhood meetings in the last four years and in response to those meetings, they have moved the proposed location of the activity center from adjacent to McDougal Park to the back of their campus, have reduced the size, and have agreed to 26 of the 28 suggested mitigations. She asked that the Planning Commission approve their Conceptual Development Plan in the same spirit of cooperation so they may move forward with a program to support their children.

Mary Griffin, project architect, described the Conceptual Development Plan, referring to drawings and plans for the project in her presentation. She described main elements of the Plan as follows:

- The existing multi-purpose room would be renovated and improved with a new lobby and would become the drama space.
- The new proposed activity center would be the gymnasium, storage, restrooms, lockers, technology and science classroom.
- The third area would be some site improvements and landscape along with a new drive and turnaround.
- The activity center has gone from the original plan for 18,000 square feet to 15,600, and has been moved from the edge of McDougal Park to 80' from the edge of McDougal Park.
- The plan was submitted to Belmont in September of 2003 and then the Initial Study was prepared and released in April of 2003 and they responded to 26 of the 28 proposed mitigations. The two that they did not respond to had to do with the placement of the building because they wanted to discuss this with the Commission. Instead of having it tight to McDougal Park, the plan as currently proposed is to push it 80' to the east, which allows a blacktop area between the activity center and the park that is for both outdoor play and overflow parking. The activity center has also been reduced in program; the

stage component and the music room were removed and instead there was a decision to renovate the multipurpose room to accommodate those needs. The two-story classroom building was removed—it is now attached as an addition to the gym building and also allows them to get the restrooms and support facilities into a lower-ceilinged form.

- The site slopes about 40 feet from the Solano Drive entry down to the lower field and it steps down in a series of terraces.
- The outdoor basketball program that takes place now would be moved inside the new gym so they would no longer have the restrictions when it rains or when it's cold, and the noise would be contained within the new gym.
- They tried to design the building so the highest part of the building faced inward to the campus and they added the storage building onto the south side to actually step the building down as it moved towards the San Carlos neighbors. There's a 25' setback between the building and the property line and there's an additional 15' setback before you reach the high part of the building, so the gym bulk is 40' off the property line.
- There's a 25' screening buffer on the San Carlos side, which would be fenced off; no activities would open out that way.
- Some of the advantages of this site location are that it is located at the lowest elevation on the site – they are already 30' down from Solano drive so that the building is tucked in behind the existing buildings – it will not be visible as one drives around the neighborhoods, it is located with an 80' setback to McDougal, 25' setback from the San Carlos neighbors, and is located in the flattest area of the site so it minimizes the cutting into the hillside that's already been cut into in the past. It is also designed so that the roof slopes away from the neighbors towards the CAS community and the outdoor gathering space is towards the CAS community.

Chair Gibson opened the Public Hearing.

Lorraine Paul, resident of San Mateo and employed by Charles Armstrong School, asked that the students and other supporters of the Charles Armstrong School raise their hands, and then asked for the Commission's approval of the proposal so that the Charles Armstrong School can continue with the education they are providing. The meeting recessed at 8:00 p.m. so that students and parents could leave the room. Meeting resumed at 8:05 p.m.

Robert Mayer, El Verano Way, speaking for himself and Bill and Jeannie Ryan, spoke in opposition to the project.

Kevin Coyne, student at CAS, spoke in favor of the project.

John Healy, 626 Dartmouth Avenue, San Carlos, spoke in opposition to the project.

Wilbur Mattison, Cupertino resident and member of the Board of Trustees of CAS since 1968, spoke in support of the project.

Carmen Holster, 620 Dartmouth Avenue, San Carlos, spoke in opposition to the project.

Mary Morrissey Parden, representing the Belmont Chamber of Commerce, stated that the Chamber supports the project.

Katie and Jeff Criswell, 638 Dartmouth Avenue, San Carlos, appeared and she spoke in opposition to the project.

Mark Hearn, Walnut Creek, former student and a member of the Board of Trustees, spoke in favor of the project.

Asad Ali, 1612 Chula Vista Drive, spoke in opposition to the project.

Patrick Kelley, 503 Dale View Avenue, Belmont, spoke in favor of the project.

Don Jones, Valdez Avenue, spoke in opposition to the project.

Richard Allison, 2040 Arbor, Belmont, and parent of a student at CAS, spoke in favor of the project.

Barry Lake, 1720 El Verano Way, speaking on behalf of Leanne Massoni, Steven Cann, and Michael Allen, and representing Neighborhoods First, an organization of concerned citizens dedicated to preserving and enhancing the peaceful character of Belmont neighborhoods, spoke in opposition to the project, noting that they had previously submitted a detailed packet of information explaining their positions on the plans and including a petition signed by over 300 residents who would be most affected by the proposed expansion.

Ed Sterbenc, 765 University, Palo Alto, and parent of a student at the school, spoke in favor of the project.

Margaret Allen, Chula Vista Drive, spoke in opposition to the project.

John Osner, 2032 Birch Avenue, San Carlos, and a teacher at CAS, spoke in favor of the project.

Patty Ansley, 631 Dartmouth Avenue, Coordinator of the Dartmouth Avenue Community Group of 48 homes in San Carlos, which backs up to the CAS property, stated her opposition to the project.

Carol Galletta, teacher at CAS, read a letter in favor of the project from Chuck Green of 2816 Wemberly Drive in Belmont, parent of a CAS student.

Ron Ansley, 631 Dartmouth Avenue, spoke in opposition to the project.

Joanne Roberts, San Francisco, parent of three former CAS students and head of the architectural committee, spoke in favor of the project.

Kent Brown, San Leandro, parent of former student and participant on the building and grounds committee for CAS, and a local architect, spoke in favor of the project.

Paul Mercandante, who resides off of Comstock Circle and is a parent of a CAS student, spoke in favor of the project.

Alicia Davidovich, 2880 Wakefield Dr., Belmont and parent of a CAS student, spoke in favor of the project.

Chair Gibson thanked the speakers for observing the time limits, and informed those who were unable to speak that there will be an opportunity to do so at the continuation of the public hearing; he will do his best to accommodate everyone who wants to speak at that time.

MOTION: By Vice Chair Parsons, seconded by Commissioner Dickenson, to continue the public hearing on the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Conceptual Development Plan for 1405 Solana Drive to a date uncertain (Appl. PA2003-0099).

Motion passed 6/0/1 by consensus, with C Wozniak recused from the discussion.

CDD Ewing added that when the date for continuation is set, a public hearing notice will be mailed to all residents in the affected area and to all those who spoke at the meeting.

Chair Gibson declared a recess at 9:00 p.m. Meeting resumed at 9:07.

Chair Gibson stated that they will conclude the evening's proceedings with questions from Commissioners. He suggested that they not get into their evaluation, but that they pose questions that they would like staff to research or questions that they would like the Armstrong people to be thinking about between now and the next hearing date.

Comments and questions from the Commission:

VC Parsons:

- For the record, it has become very clear that the playing fields are owned by the City of Belmont.
- He raised the following questions about economic impacts and economic contributions:
 - ✓ Someone stated that CAS does not pay taxes, being a non-profit. Is that a fact?
 - ✓ Would like to know a breakdown of the employees in the school; how many are Belmont residents?
 - ✓ Is it a Belmont business that does the landscaping and maintenance?
 - ✓ Do they buy their school supplies, etc., from local businesses?
 - ✓ Confirm the cost to students to attend.
 - ✓ How many students are residents of Belmont?
 - ✓ Provide a breakdown of the students by grade level so they could see how the idea of a gymnasium fits with the student body population.

- ✓ Does CAS offer any special benefits to Belmont residents – do they offer a scholarship, for example? Is there a program for kids who can't afford to pay the tuition?
- He was confused about the drawings. Which of the four sets are the most current? Which site plan do they actually use for discussion purposes?
- Would like a discussion of the classrooms – they talked about the gymnasium but didn't have any discussion about the other facilities.
- Would like clarification of hours of operations. Staff report, website, environmental study and some other documents differ.
- Doesn't feel he has a grasp about the sports programs that were held elsewhere- would like to know what their sports activities include.
- Drawings indicate rather large seating areas, especially in the prospectus that they did not have at the meeting. What would the seating capacity be for the gymnasium with the pull-out seats and also for the other room in the original administration building? How is that addressed in terms of providing parking for those kinds of events, and what would those requirements be?
- In looking at their website and other places in the documents, he sees things discussed such as summer school, which he thought was held in June and July, and yet this year they're proposing to also hold it in August. That could possibly decrease the amount of time the park is available to the community.
- Would like verification of what happens if there are school-sponsored ball games going on after 4:00 p.m.
- Would like to know what time the athletic fields are used and for what kind of sports, and what kind of sports will be played inside the gymnasium. If the things that are now held at other gyms are now going to be held at the school, there will be increased traffic and use of the facility.
- He did not see any discussion by the applicant as to why earlier discussion about re-siting the facility was not even considered or discussed in this presentation.
- Would like to know if, in evaluating the current CUP, the school is operating under the CUP or is it in violation in terms of hours of operation, adults driving cars to adult classes, and parking requirements
- Has no problems with the idea of an indoor athletic facility for this school and thinks the school and its program is great, but added that the Commission has to be concerned about the neighborhood community. Since it is not a public school. It does not have the rights that a public school has in terms of getting whatever facilities they want in this neighborhood. They have to take into consideration the quality of the neighborhood.
- Would like to see a drawing very simply done showing the re-siting to accommodate the mitigations.
- Would like an analysis of what other elementary schools have as a gymnasium and their sizes. Chair Gibson suggested including San Carlos as well as Belmont in the answer to that question.

C Frautschi:

- Would like to see the campus activities arranged in some sort of Excel sheet so that it is easier to compare what's happening in the different categories. There is anticipated

increase whether in people or use, and he finds it hard to judge if the anticipated increase has to do with the increase in the student body from 220 to 260.

- He is not so much worried about the regular school activities as the activities that seem to be appearing in the evening. It appears to him that the school is booked up every single evening, even with Wednesdays being a square dance group.
- Regarding the traffic study report, when the Commission looked at this project to increase the student body to 260, his decision was based on the anticipated traffic increase that was involved with the regular school day. He does not get a clear idea of what the traffic impact will be as a result of the additional adult classes.
- He believes that any thing that happens has to include reworking of the agreement on McDougal Park. He feels that the City can no longer pay the full tab for that park, whether it involves other mitigations of money concessions or bathrooms being built on site by Armstrong, or something along those lines. He has been thinking about this for a long time and believes it should be looked at down the line.

C Long:

- Agreed with C Frautschi about the traffic count and wondered if there is a way to install a traffic counter that would give them an objective way of figuring out what the real comings and goings and traffic are in real time, today, or in the next thirty days.
- Would like to see the applicant answer a question that Mary Lou Orr had asked him: “What does it take to get the neighborhood to agree to this?” He brought it up now because he thinks the answer will guide his decision-making process through this project. He questioned 1) why the school feels there are so many opponents in the nearby neighborhood, and 2) if the Commission approves the project, what is a way to make the red on the chart turn to white. He’s interested in seeing a game plan for that, which would be an important part of getting his support.

C Dickenson:

- Also had an issue with the parking access and asked if the applicant has examined a one-way driveway circling through and around the property, and asked if staff could come back with an answer to that.
- The issue of bulk came up in public testimony and he had not seen that addressed. Do we have a back-up plan for the building to minimize it’s exposure to the neighboring properties?

C Horton:

- Would like to understand what the Charles Armstrong Institute is. Where these classes are held and when, and what size they are. She commented that sometimes it’s referred to as a teaching institute and sometimes it’s referred to as the Charles Armstrong Institute
- Would like to know how the multi-purpose room is going to be used once this activity center is built. It appears to her from the matrix that staff prepared that almost every activity that is currently in the multi-purpose room is moving to the gymnasium. She wondered why they need the multi-purpose room if they have an activity center; it seems to duplicate itself.
- The matrix that staff put together indicates that there are about nine events during the year that bring 275 to 400 people to the school. With the gymnasium built according to the

plan, she could not see how that kind of parking would be accommodated and wondered how it would be handled.

- Would like clarification about the location of the drama performance. The matrix says it is going to stay off site; however, there was a letter from a teacher that said it would be on site.
- Regarding the sporting events, it looks to her like there are about 53 home games at CAS that are held at 4:00. How do the opposing teams get to CAS and, if its football and they're playing on the field, do they go to Parks & Rec and reserve the field or how is that handled?
- She commented that she researched the entire file at City Hall from 1984 to present, and learned that in 1984 and prior to that the multi-purpose room at the McDougal School was a San Mateo County polling place. She would like to know why that practice stopped.
- Would like to know the average length of time a student spends at the school, since it has been referred to as a transitional school.
- Wondered why they have not addressed item 18, the relocation of the buildings to another spot on the site.

For staff:

- Would like to add IHM to the gymnasium comparison that staff has already done, as well as the grades that each school supports, the total number of students at each school and the total number of students in grades 6 through 8 at that school, and whether those schools have a multipurpose room and what is the associated parking.
- Legal question around the additional classrooms which, on the architectural plans are called classrooms and in presentations they're called technology centers. The Conditional Use Permit asks for 260 students, but if additional classrooms are built can the City deny the right to use those classrooms as classrooms? In other words, an additive sort of thing?

Chair Gibson:

- Would be interested to know if CAS pays a parcel tax and if any sales tax revenue is generated by any kind of sales that go on there.
- Would like to know what the requirements would be for a public school to undertake a similar project and what the practice has been in Belmont for such projects for public schools.
- Would like to know if it would be possible to include as a condition of approval or a recommendation for renegotiation of the park agreement. That is not directly on the table but would like to know later if it could be a condition.
- From the CAS people, he would again ask why the high-ceiling gymnasium is needed.
- Would like to receive from the architect an estimate of the expected decibel level on the San Carlos side of the gym.
- Would like to know what increase in varsity games there would be with this new gymnasium.

VC Parsons:

- There had been discussion of a summer camp, which was not included in the environmental document. Would like to know when and where it is operated and what the hours are. If

it's in the park after summer school is out, are they restricting access to the park during those additional times that they're there?

- Would like to know the City's annual cost to maintain these facilities, since the City is in a budget crisis.

CDD Ewing added the following:

- He would like to be able to provide the Fire Department's requirements as applied to this plan.
- He forewarned Katie and Jeff Criswell that the Commission might take them up on their offer to view the proposed project site from their back yard.
- He offered to go further into General Plan Policy 2062.3 about park access, based on the testimony heard earlier.

VC Parsons commented that since several people, including Rosalee, made a comment that they just want to exercise their right to build, he thought that that issue needed to be defined in legal terms. He did not believe that being a private institution in the City of Belmont under a CUP, which was negotiated with the purchase of the property or shortly thereafter, included any right on the part of the school to build a gym. Since that issue was raised two different times during the meeting he felt it should be clarified. He further commented that he is trying to be very objective, he has not made up his mind about this project and that he was personally offended by some of the things that went on in terms of people going out and soliciting people on the streets with information that wasn't necessarily true. With reference to a letter and comments from citizens implying that the City was stonewalling and keeping this project from coming before the Commission, VC Parsons emphasized that the Planning Commission has never, ever been in a position to determine when a project is going to come before it until staff has said it's ready, and staff has not, to his knowledge, ever purposely kept a project off the agenda. He feels that there is a lot of misinformation going around but was pleased at the tenor of the meeting.

Chair Gibson asked for staff's opinion as to how the phrase "right to a view," which appears in the General Plan, makes its way into the City's Zoning Ordinance and specifically into the Commission's deliberations about this project.

C Frautschi asked staff for a clearer picture of exactly what the Parking Management Plan is, as referred to on page 46 of the staff report.

CDD Ewing stated that staff will come up with a list of things that staff can answer and things that they will look to CAS for, and try to provide that information to the Commission in written form before the next meeting, and invited the Commission to feel free to communicate any further questions to him.

Responding to Chair Gibson's question about when the next meeting might be, CDD Ewing replied that he is looking at possibly Thursday, December 2, or Monday, December 6, and that he will be polling each of them by email over the next day or so for availability. C Frautschi noted that he and C Parsons will not be available on December 7.

6. NEW BUSINESS: None

7. REPORTS, STUDIES, UPDATES AND COMMENTS: None

**8. PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 2004:**

Liaison: Commissioner Frautschi
Alternate Liaison: Commissioner Wozniak

9. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m. to a regular meeting on Tuesday, December 7, 2004 at 7:00 p.m. at Twin Pines Senior and Community Center.

Craig A. Ewing, AICP
Planning Commission Secretary

*Audiotapes of Planning Commission Meetings are available for review
in the Community Development Department
Please call (650) 595-7416 to schedule an appointment.*